

Application No.: 10/622,211

Docket No.: MWS-055RCE

**REMARKS**

Claims 4, 7, 12, 15, 17, 22, 24, 25 and 30 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicants contend that claims 4-18 and 22-32 are patentable and in condition for allowance as discussed below.

**I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner deems the subject matter of claims 4-18 and 22-32 as allowable in the Office Action dated 10/18/2007. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims comply with all formal requirements indicated in the Office Action dated 10/18/2007, as further discussed below.

**II. Objections to Claims**

Claims 22-32 were objected to because of informalities. The Examiner indicates that the claims are directed to a "device readable medium." The Examiner asserts that it is unclear what the "device" is directed to, (Office Action, page 2, § 4).

Claims 17, 22, 25 and 30 have been amended to recite "computer readable medium." Support for this amendment can be found at page 40, lines 2-5 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments address the Examiner's objections. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to claims 22-32.

**III. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite (Office Action, page 3, § 6). The Examiner asserts that claim 24 should be dependent upon claim 23, not claim 22.

Claim 24 has been amended to depend from claim 23, as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Application No.: 10/622,211

Docket No.: MWS-055RCE

#### IV. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 4-18 and 22-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Examiner asserts that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter (Office Action, page 3, § 9). The Examiner indicates that while the claims appear to recite a concrete, useful and tangible result, they are not limited to one practical application. That is the claims appear to be directed to any and all applications of a "block diagram" or a "block diagram environment."

Claims 4, 7, 22 and 25 have been amended to recite "a block diagram representing a multi-rate dynamic system." Support for this amendment can be found at page 1, lines 5-7 and 17-19. It is believed that this amendment limits the claims so that they do not encompass any or all applications of a block diagram or block diagram environment.

Claims 12 and 30 have been amended to recite "a block representing an elemental multi-rate dynamic system." Support for this amendment can be found at page 1, lines 5-7 and page 6, lines 13-14.

Claims 15 and 17 have been amended to recite "a multi-rate block diagram model representing a multi-rate dynamic system." Support for this amendment can be found at page 1, lines 5-7 and 17-19.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 4-18 and 22-32 recite a practical application of block diagrams. Specifically amended claims 4-11 and 22-29 are directed to block diagrams representing multi-rate dynamic systems. Claims 12-14 and 30-32 are directed to blocks representing elemental multi-rate dynamic systems.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 4-18 and 22-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Application No.: 10/622,211

Docket No.: MWS-055RCE

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims comply with all formal requirements identified in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass claims 4-18 and 22-32 to allowance.

Application No.: 10/622,211

Docket No.: MWS-055RCE

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above comments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-055RCE. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Neslihan I. Doran

Registration No.: L0389

LAHIVE &amp; COCKFIELD, LLP

One Post Office Square

Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127

(617) 227-7400

(617) 742-4214 (Fax)

Attorney/Agent For Applicant